REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-14, 28-41 and 55-68 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 7-12, 14, 28-39, 41, and 55-68, are amended, no claims are cancelled or added. The amendments to the claims as indicated herein do not add any new matter to this application.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On Monday, March 16, 2009, Applicants, represented by Robert Chee and Kirk Wong, conducted an interview with the USPTO, represented by Examiner Jamie Atala. The Claims of the Application were discussed in relation to the reference, *Shoff*. Applicants agreed to submit a formal reply for further consideration by the Examiner. Examiner agreed to contact Applicants should Examiner wish any clarification with regard to the arguments, as discussed in the interview.

CLAIM REJECTIONS—35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-10, 12-14, 28-37, 39-41, 55-64 and 66-68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,400,407 ("Zigmond") in view of PCT Publication No. WO 92/22983 ("Browne") in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0210824 ("Shoff") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,097,441 ("Allport"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 28, and 55 appear as follows;

> 1.   A process for video frame-specific tagging of media streams with
> tag translation at a receiver, comprising:
>   receiving a media stream at said receiver;
>   storing said media stream on a storage device on said receiver;
>   detecting video frame-specific tags inserted into said media stream;
>   processing said tags;

performing appropriate actions in response to said tags which
include command and control information instructing said receiver to
perform certain actions; and
displaying program material in said stored media stream from said
storage device to a viewer.

28.   An apparatus for video frame-specific tagging of television audio
and video broadcast streams with tag translation at a receiver, comprising:
a storage device on said receiver;
a module that receives said media stream at said receiver;
a module that stores said media stream on said storage device;
a module that detects video frame-specific tags inserted into said
media stream;
a module that processes said tags;
a module that performs appropriate actions in response to said tags
which include command and control information instructing said receiver
to perform certain actions; and
a module that displays program material in said stored media
stream from said storage device to a viewer.

55.   A program storage medium readable by a computer, tangibly
embodying a program of instructions executable by the computer to
perform method steps for video frame-specific tagging of television audio
and video broadcast streams with tag translation at a receiver, comprising:
receiving said media stream at said receiver;
storing said media stream on a storage device on said receiver;
detecting video frame-specific tags inserted into said media stream;
processing said tags;
performs appropriate actions in response to said tags which include
command and control information instructing said receiver to perform
certain actions; and
displaying program material in said stored media stream from said
storage device to a viewer

As discussed with the Examiner during the March 16, 2009, telephone interview, *Shoff*

does not teach or suggest the detection and processing of frame specific tags inserted into the

media stream as the frames from amended Claim 1 clearly refer to video frames, not HTML

frames. In the Response to Arguments section, the Office Action states that "Shoff et al teaches

the detection and processing of frame specific tags as described in paragraphs 0085-0091."

However, *Shoff* fails to teach tags associated with video frames.

Shoff states: "The new HTML extension attributes are given below in Table 1. TABLE 1

HTML Extension Attributes FRAMESET usedefault **Used to determine where the focus is**

located in a tab-based user interface within a FRAME by specifying the URL for the file

containing the map, followed by a `#`, followed by the name of the USEDEFAULT. If the

argument to USEDEFAULT starts with a `#`, the map is assumed to be in the same document as

the USEDEFAULT tag." (emphasis added) (*Shoff*, par. [0088], Table 1).

The Office Action has confused HTML frames with video frames in a media stream. The

Office Action states "it is well known in the art to use frame specific tags to mark text, graphics,

and graphical user interfaces with web pages." (*Office Action*, p. 5). However, HTML frames

tag allows a user to display more than one HTML page in a browser window. Each frame

designated by a frame tag within a frameset tag displays a different HTML document in a Web

page. Thus, HTML code may refer to a specific frame being shown to a viewer but must be

within that specific frame's frame tag which in turn must be within a frameset tag. Video frame-

specific tags, as used in Claim 1, refer to video frames in the media stream. Thus, the statement

that it is well known in the art to use frame-specific tags with Web pages may be accurate with

respect to HTML frame tags in a Web page, but is not accurate with respect to video frame

specific tags inserted into a media stream, as these two terms have completely different meanings

and are in different technology areas.

Therefore, *Zigmond* in view of *Browne* and in further view of *Shoff* and in further view of

Allport does not teach or disclose the invention as claimed.

Claims 1, 28, and 55 are allowable. Claims 2-10, 12-14, and 29-37, 39-41, and 56-64,

66-68 are dependent upon Claims 1, 28, and 55, respectively, and are allowable. Applicant

respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants respectfully request to be contacted by the Examiner should the Examiner wish any clarification with regard to these arguments, as discussed in the interview.

CLAIM REJECTIONS—35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11, 38 and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,400,407 ("Zigmond ") in view of PCT Publication No. WO 92/22983 ("Browne") in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0210824 ("Shoff") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,648,824 ("Dunn"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is deemed moot in view of Applicant's comments regarding Claims 1, 28, and 55, above. Claims 11, 38, and 65 are dependent upon independent Claims 1, 28, and 55, respectively. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker LLP

Dated: ___3/25/09_____   ___/RobertSChee#58554/_____
                                   Robert S. Chee
                                   Reg. No. 58,554

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California   95110-1083
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1213
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076